

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 24 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, stating that the limitation that "the packet/cell identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port constitutes new matter".

In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1, 21, 23 and 24 to recite that the packet identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and to one other output port for a multicast packet identifier, and claim 11 to recite that the cell identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and to one other output port for a multicast cell identifier.

For example, referring to Figs. 5 and 6 of Applicant's disclosure, the multicast packet identifiers for lookup tables 60, 61, 62, and 63 are directed to the first and second output ports, the second and third output ports, the third and fourth output ports and the fourth and first output ports, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 do not include new matter, and respectfully requests that the rejection under section 112 be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant respectfully request the amendment be entered as it puts the claims in better form for appeal.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,279 ("Milway") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,473,598 ("Takatori"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,600,630 ("Takano").

As stated above, Applicant has amended claims 1, 21, 23 and 24 to recite that the packet identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and to one other output port for a multicast packet identifier, and claim 11 to recite that the cell identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and to one other output port for a multicast cell identifier.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, none of the cited references, when taken alone, or in combination, disclose that the packet/cell identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and to one other output port for a multicast packet/cell identifier.

Indeed, there is nothing in the general language of Takatori that discloses the claimed features, especially, that the packet/cell identifiers for each respective table are directed to only one other output port in addition to the first designated output port for that table. Moreover, Takano fails to cure the deficiencies in Milway and Takatori.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over Milway in view of Takatori and Takano. For at least the reason that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and claim 22 depends from claim 21, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888